

25th March 1922]

III—*cont.*

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—*cont.*

DEMAND XXV—EXCHANGE.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding 16.52 lakhs under Demand XXV—Exchange.”

*Motion* 689.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

689. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 16,52,000 for Exchange by Rs. 100.*

“My object in moving this is merely to know why we in this presidency, who are not responsible for the exchange policy resulting in this loss, should bear this loss. From the statement made by the hon. the Finance Member when presenting the budget, I see we paid nothing last year and that there were some orders from the Government of India fixing some rate and saying that we in this presidency should pay according to that rate and that the loss should be borne from the coming year. I suppose it is not a votable or a non-votable item and I do not know what it is. I do not say anything at all one way or the other. I do not want to embarrass my hon. Friend, but I want him on behalf of this presidency to represent to the Government of India and the Secretary of State that we are not responsible for this loss and that we should not be debited with any of this. I would like to know what my hon. Friend himself thinks about the matter, but I do think, Sir, that it is one of those old maxims that those who have no control should not be asked to pay. In this particular instance we have no control whatever over the financial policy which has resulted, or which is likely to result in this loss. I would therefore make this motion.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“Sir, I am not quite sure if I have clearly understood my hon. Friend’s motion, but as far as I can make out, it amounts to this, that because the Government of India have not been very successful in their currency policy so far as it relates to the matter of exchange, we are to demand of them that they shall arrange for us to transact business always on the basis of a 2s. rupee. If the hon. Member will give me any plausible arguments with which I can enforce that request when I go to Simla to discuss the question of the contribution, I shall be glad to consider them. But I am afraid at present I should be laughed out of court before I had stated his proposition.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“Sir, so far as I can recollect, I do not think that we have had this loss debited against us in any of the previous years. If that is a fact, it is a sufficient argument why we should not be burdened with this this time.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“If I may invite my friend’s attention to paragraphs 166, 167 and 168 of the memorandum, he will find an explanation of the reason why this was not debited in the previous year. It amounts simply to this, that the Government of India had not fixed the rate. We are therefore bringing forward a supplementary estimate now that

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[25th March 1922]

they have fixed it. As regards the coming year, they have fixed the rate and that has enabled us to put it in the budget and not to ask for a supplementary grant at the end of the year."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ Before I withdraw my motion, I would only say one word and that is that perhaps the Government of India were convinced before that they were responsible for the financial muddle which has resulted in this great loss and that that was the reason why they did not fix the rate hitherto and did not call upon Local Governments to make a contribution on the result of their transactions. But now they are clearly making an attempt to raise a debit against these provinces and I trust the hon. the Finance Member when he goes to Simla will make the best of the situation and try to get it withdrawn as early as possible.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ I need hardly say, Sir, that if I could get 16½ lakhs conscience money out of the Government of India, I should be very glad to take it.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Demand XXV—Exchange—16·52 lakhs was then put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

#### DEMAND XXVI—CIVIL WORKS—IN CHARGE OF CIVIL OFFICERS.

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—“ Sir, I beg leave to move for a grant not exceeding 37·53 lakhs for Civil Works in charge of civil officers.”

##### *Motion 690.*

The following motion was not made :—

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

690. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 34,260 for the Trichinopoly district board for special repairs to trunk roads caused by flood damages.*

##### *Motions 691 to 695.*

Mr. F. J. RICHARDS :—“ May I rise to a point of order, Sir? Motions 691, 692 and 693 have no relation whatever to the demands which have been moved. Is it in order, Sir, to move them?”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ If the hon. Member Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar had been here, and if he had moved these, Mr. Richards should have raised the point of order. But in the circumstances I really don't see why I should express an opinion on motions which have not been made.”

The following motions were not made :—

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—

691. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,000 for constructing a new fly-proof kitchen in the Central Jail, Rajahmundry.*

25th March 1922]

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—

692. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 11,280 for constructing 15 cells for juveniles in the Central Jail, Cannanore, by Rs. 9,680.*

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—

693. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 16,000 for constructing 32 cells in the close prison, Central Jail, Trichinopoly.*

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

694. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 35,18,000 for original works by Rs. 100.*

Mr. N. A. V. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI :—

695. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 37.53 lakhs for Demand under Civil Works—In charge of Civil Officers by Rs. 5 lakhs.*

Demand XXVI—Civil Works—In charge of Civil officers—37.53 lakhs was then put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

**DEMAND XXVII—CIVIL WORKS—PUBLIC WORKS OFFICERS  
(RESERVED PORTIONS).**

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ I move, Sir, for a grant not exceeding 2.14 lakhs under Demand XXVII—Civil Works (Reserved portions).”

*Motion 696.*

3-15 p.m. Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ I beg to make the following motion :—

696. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 11,000 for constructing a left wing in front of the Military Secretary's room in the building at Government House, Ootacamund.*

“ In making this motion I should like to have, Sir, some information as regards the arrangements that are made in Ootacamund for the Government House. For the last two or three years there have been provided several extensions both by building new buildings and by taking over other buildings occupied by other people. In the last year provision was made for the construction of two or three buildings and also for the construction of two gates. Such of us as had been to Ootacamund last year found that some of the buildings that were occupied hitherto by the clerks were occupied by the bodyguards of His Excellency the Governor. I do not know, Sir, whether it is the intention of Government that those buildings ought to be taken over for the Government House and that they should also form part of the Government House hereafter. They are in a very good locality and they could be utilized as residences of Under Secretaries and others. If they are not wanted they can be sold. If they are sold they will fetch very good prices indeed. So, Sir, it is with the intention of asking what are the new buildings that are to be put up in the current year and what is proposed to be done next year and whether it is the intention of the Government to take over these buildings which were occupied by the clerks permanently for the Government House that I brought this motion. One object which induced me to do this is this. These buildings are not provided for in the current

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiar] [25th March 1922]

year's budget while the estimate has been sanctioned in February and work has already been started."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I am afraid I cannot regard these enquiries as relevant to a motion to omit a specific allotment for Rs. 11,000. I am quite prepared to justify that allotment. As a matter of fact it is the remainder of a very much larger sum for a work which is in progress and which is practically finished. I cannot carry in my head all the items of work for the next year. This particular item was, I understand, sanctioned by the Government of India and provision was made from the current year out of the lump allotment passed by this House. The Chief Engineer tells me that the work is practically done."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"It would have been better if some information were given. I see the difficulty of the hon. the Home Member."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"If the hon. Member had given me notice, I would have come prepared."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"As I said it is not my particular intention to object to this particular grant. So I don't press it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Demand XXVII.—Civil Works—Public Works officers for 2·14 lakhs was then put and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXVIII—CIVIL WORKS—PUBLIC WORKS OFFICERS  
(TRANSFERRED PORTIONS).

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"I beg to move Demand XXVIII—Civil Works for a provision of 7·11 lakhs."

*Motion 697.*

The following motion was not made:—

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERTMAL CHETTI:—

697. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for constructing a residence for the Collector, Coimbatore.*

*Motion 698.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

698. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for new Collector's office, Vellore.*

"At page 8, item No. 10, it will be seen that the estimate is said to cost Rs. 2,12,400. The outlay was Rs. 2,929 for land acquisition and the probable amount of expenditure for the current year is estimated to be only Rs. 1,000. For 1921-22 the amount put down there is only Rs. 1,000 and the amount proposed to be spent for the next year is Rs. 30,000. As only the land seems to have been acquired and as only very little amount out of the total estimate is expected to be spent during the year, I think, Sir, we may as well postpone the commencement of the execution of this work till we

25th March 1922] [Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu]

arrive at more fortunate times. That is my idea. I do not mean to say that this should be abandoned. In fact, Sir, North Arcot is my own district. I should be the last man to cut away any item of expenditure there. All I can say is whether this cannot be postponed."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:— "I am glad, Sir, that the proposer of this motion is a native of North Arcot district. I feel certain that any appeal I may make to him on behalf of North Arcot will not fall on deaf ears. This new district was constituted in 1911 and ever since that time repeated attempts have been made for the purpose of securing a habitation for its principal office in the district. The necessary land and building called 'Mayne's bungalow' were acquired nearly seven years ago. Plans and estimates were prepared on several occasions since but they had to be turned down on each occasion on the score of improvements which were suggested from time to time thereto. Last year we had final plans and estimates but according to the arrangement which was then suggested that new works should not be included in the budget, this estimate should not have been included in the last year's estimate. Nevertheless it was so included and was allowed to get through. Probably the House knew full well that inasmuch as I had deliberately included it I would justify the allotment entered in the budget. The gentleman who had tabled the motion last year to eliminate that sum did not move that motion feeling, as I said, that I would justify the position. From 1918 onwards officer after officer who visited North Arcot has noted that the Collector's office was housed in a most incommodeous, inconvenient and dingy little building which was originally intended to be occupied by the gosha ladies of some of the State prisoners who were removed to the Vellore fort. The records are not merely kept in different parts of these offices but they are also kept in the building called the Mayne's bungalow which, as already stated, was acquired seven years ago and which has not yet been reconstructed. A portion of the records, I am told, still remains in Chittoor as there is no room for them in Vellore. Under these circumstances I ask whether efficient administration is possible at all. In November last I went to Vellore and had the estimate considerably curtailed because I knew the financial stringency. If the building is not now sanctioned the consequence will be that nearly 50 to 60 thousand rupees which was spent seven years ago for the acquisition of the site and building thereon called Mayne's bungalow which is now tumbling down and the money spent in 1920-21 as well as that spent in the current year will all be waste. I, therefore, ask the House, and particularly the mover of the motion who happens to be a native of the North Arcot district, whether he would allow the administration of his own district to be conducted in such distressing conditions. I can assure the House that the work is really being done under most distressing conditions. The consequence of dropping the proposal will be that all the parties and their pleaders and other gentlemen who wish to see the Collector will have to go to his residence. They have all to go to his residence because there is no place in the office to receive them. For this reason we have also installed telephonic communication between his office and residence."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"I do not press it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

[25th March 1922]

*Motion 699.*

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—“ I beg to make the following motion :—

699. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for quarters for the District Forest Officer, Cuddapah.*

“ I wish to know if any rent is collected on such buildings, or are they built merely to accommodate the officers free.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ Ordinary rent will be charged. The item is an item passed by the Council after a good deal of debate.”

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—“ If it is to be rented, then I wish to make a few remarks. An investment of Rs. 30,000 at 7 per cent on capital and 3 per cent on maintenance should bring a return of Rs. 250 per month. Is the District Forest Officer who is to occupy the House likely to pay Rs. 250 per mensem? I do not think so. This investment will therefore not pay.”

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“ During the course of the debate on budget grants last year, the hon. the Finance Member was pleased to state that the question of levying higher rates of rents was under correspondence with the Secretary of State and I do not know what the result of that is. If the old system is to continue, I am sure the tax-payer will be a great loser. According to the existing rates, if I remember right, the officer has to pay 10 per cent of his salary or 5 per cent of the invested amount whichever be less. Now, the Government is borrowing at the rate of 6 per cent and the cost of maintaining these buildings is generally calculated to be 2 per cent of the cost of construction. That means that unless we levy 8 or 9 per cent of the invested amount as annual rent on public buildings, the interest on the amount invested on these buildings will not be paid and the tax-payer will have to pay it. In this connexion I wish to know the reason why all these buildings that are built for public officers are built from the ordinary revenues of the State. They are works of permanent utility. They are expected to pay some return and why should not the Government have a scheme for this and utilize the borrowed capital for the construction of these buildings? Why should they go on in the old method of meeting the expenditure from the ordinary revenues and make it a burden on the present generation when they are works of a permanent nature.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ On the last point I would only say this: that we are going to meet out of the advance not only this but a good deal of our current expenditure in the current year. As regards the matter of calculation of rates of rent, that is a matter arising in the transferred Department of Public Works.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ I am glad, Sir, that the question has been raised, because it gives me an opportunity of emphasising a matter which is of a very great importance to the Forest Department, namely, the provision of decent housing for our officers. Year after year we have been obliged to cut out essential proposals for the housing of the District Forest Officers. This year I think something like seven or eight items have gone out. It is a very serious question what we are to do with new recruits when

25th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

they come out. They have to be posted somewhere; we do not know to what districts to post them, because not a house of a suitable description can be found in many districts. I could give many instances in point. Some were mentioned last year. I should be very thankful if the discussion of this particular motion led to a thorough investigation of the steps which are necessary to remedy a state of affairs which can only be described as extremely unsatisfactory. The practical financial difficulty lies in the fact that you cannot expect officers to pay rents which will give an adequate return on the present rates at which buildings are constructed by the Public Works Department. It is quite certain that 10 per cent of the salaries of the occupiers in the case of forest officers will not ordinarily give an adequate return on the cost of buildings of this sort. It seems to me that there are two alternatives. One is to recognize frankly that the additional cost must be met by the State and the other is to drop the method of employing the Public Works Department to build substantial structures and to ask our officers to accept houses of brick and mud with thatched roofs such as those often constructed for railway engineers when railway works are in progress. They are fairly cool, and comfortable; and they would be better than nothing. As things are now, rented bungalows are not procurable. And there are cases of men living miles away from their headquarters because they are not able to get proper accommodation. It is a very serious question; and the seriousness is going to be aggravated now that the Council, as I am glad to note, has committed itself to a policy of development, because that will mean more forest officers as our development schemes go forward expanding, as I hope, rapidly. We shall have to provide some form of housing for our officers, for one cannot expect men to go and work in places where there are no houses, no roofs over their heads. I have again to say that I am very glad that the matter has been brought forward."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

*Motion 700.*

The following motion was not made:—

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI:—

700. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 15,000 for quarters for the Conservator, Salem.*

*Motion 701.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

701. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 29,000 for constructing district registrar's office.*

“This is item 13 at page 8 of the Public Works budget. The amount of the estimate is Rs. 39,000. Nothing was spent in 1920-21 and in 1921-22 also nothing seems to have been spent. But in 1922-23 Rs. 29,000 is proposed to be spent. It appears to me that it is altogether a new work. Consequently, I wish to know whether this cannot be postponed, if it cannot be abandoned.”

[25th March 1922]

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“Sir, this is an incomplete work for which already Rs. 3,000 have been spent. By mistake it is not so stated in the budget estimate.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

*Motion 702.*

The following motion was not made :—

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—

“702. To omit the allotment of Rs. 7,800 for iron record-racks for the District Court, Trichinopoly.”

*Motion 703.*

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—“I beg to make the following motion :—

703. To omit the allotment of Rs. 7,500 for constructing a fly-proof kitchen in the new Central Jail, Vellore.

“My reason for making the motion is this: Rs. 29,000 for a kitchen appears to be very high. It is impossible to make a kitchen absolutely fly-proof. Flies will get in somehow. Even persons with cleanly habits and clean dress have flies over them, and even under a punka flies are seen sitting on the food on the dining table. Much more so, in the case of cooks and maties who are unclean and dirty. Flies naturally sit on them, and thus they are carried into the kitchen. Any provision for fly-proof shutters to a kitchen is a waste and may be avoided.”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“Mr. President, on expert examination and on expert counsel ranging, I believe, for about three years, the system of having fly-proof kitchens in the Central Jails has been adopted. With all respect to the hon. Mover I cannot accept his ideas as to what is necessary for sanitary purposes in the jails. Anyhow we have already spent Rs. 14,000 last year. I do not know whether the hon. Member proposes that further work should now be stopped and the money already spent should be wasted. I may mention this for the information of the hon. Member: that most of the coolie labour in the construction of this fly-proof kitchen is convict labour which we are using for the purpose. If he thinks that we are spending more, there again, Sir, I am under the control of the Public Works Department, which scrutinizes every single rupee which is spent. I am unable to see how I can stop the work now.”

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—“I do not propose that the work should be stopped. I simply say that the fly-proof shutters which is an item of expenditure may be abandoned and other items such as flooring, roofing, etc., may be proceeded with. In this way savings may be effected.”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“Probably my experience may be of some use to the Council and my friend Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar. In the Trivandrum Central Jail large numbers of persons were suffering from dysentery and in spite of best treatment of the medical officer in charge of the prisons, this disease persisted in continuing. At length a suggestion was made that, if a fly-proof kitchen was provided for the room in which food was cooked for the prisoners, the disease would disappear. The suggestion was adopted and there was an immediate and perceptible improvement in

25th March 1922] [Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

the health of the prisoners. So, I believe, there is really benefit in the construction of this fly-proof kitchen in the jails where large numbers of persons are confined. Probably, in the light of this information, my friend will not press his resolution."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ I think, if the hon. Mover would visit the fly-proof kitchen in the Penitentiary, he will see that it is possible to keep flies out.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

*Motion 704.*

3-45 p.m. Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

704. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 14,000 for constructing quarters for inspector, etc.*

“ Sir, the total cost of the estimate as entered in page 10 of the Civil Works budget is Rs. 63,300. According to the book on type-designs and their cost published by the Public Works Department, I find an inspector's quarters should cost Rs. 2,510. A head constable's quarters should cost Rs. 273 and a constable's hut should cost Rs. 174. Applying these rates the total cost of building one inspector's quarters and huts for 7 head constables and 80 constables must be Rs. 18,341. I find 75 per cent should be added to it to arrive at the current schedule of rates.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ May I ask the hon. Member what is the date of the scale from which he is quoting as the standard rate.”

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—“ This work was published in 1907 or 1908. I am adding 75 per cent to the cost to bring up the total to the present schedule rates. Applying the rates as appearing in the book referred to above and adding 75 per cent the total of this work ought to be Rs. 32,000 and not more. Still a sum of Rs. 63,000 is provided for. I wish to know why there is so much difference in the sanctioned amount.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ I am afraid I am not in a position to enter into the details of the estimate for these buildings; but I observe that they are to be constructed in a place called Russellkonda, which is rather remote from civilization or at least from those aspects of civilization which include ample provision of labour and building materials. It is just possible that that is the reason why this estimate seems high. But it would be really a much more practical proposition, though in this case it is rather late in the day if my hon. Friend Mr. Namberumal Chettiar—I know he is a great contractor—would come forward with tenders at rates substantially below those adopted by the Public Works Department. If he is prepared to do that, I have not the slightest doubt that something in the nature of a deal would be quite welcome.”

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—“ Last year the hon. the Home Member offered a similar contract to me. What I wish to say is that even if we add 75 per cent, the total estimate comes only to Rs. 32,000. Taking into consideration the distance from the railway centre, there must be some reason for the cost being double. As the hon. the Home Member promised to go into the matter, I do not press the motion.”

[25th March 1922]

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ May I first of all say, Sir, that this is not a matter which I, as Home Member, can go into? The matter is in the hands of the hon. the Minister.”

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—“ Sir, there is no special need for increasing the estimate at Russellkonda. Russellkonda is a place which abounds in building materials. There is also a saw-mill located there. That means there is a timber depot at Russellkonda. Bricks and all building materials are also available at very cheap rates at Russellkonda. I come from that place and I claim that it is not far from civilization. It is my firm conviction that building materials are much cheaper in Russellkonda than at any other place in the Ganjam district. Therefore, I do not see why this estimate should have been increased to such a large amount as Rs. 63,300.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ From what the hon. the Home Member has stated, it is really a matter for consideration for the hon. the Minister in charge of the Public Works Department whether he cannot reconsider the estimates prepared. Here is a statement made by a distinguished gentleman of the experience of Mr. Namberumal Chettiar. He is not speaking without facts and figures. He has considerable experience in contract work. He knows exactly how things are working in different places. I think, the Council should benefit by the observations made by him from his great experience. I would therefore appeal to the hon. the Minister to go into the matter fully and see if any reduction is possible. This much I do say that it is not always safe to adhere to rates mentioned by the Public Works Department, as something sacred and immutable. We have known time and on that a work for which an estimate had been prepared by the Public Works Department for a high figure could be done for a much lower sum.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ There are schedule rates for each part of districts. The Assistant Engineer there in charge of the Russellkonda division is a very experienced officer who has constructed seven buildings recently in that locality. I am sure he must have taken the standard rates of the Public Works Department into consideration. But, if really there is anything which is very much in the estimate, I will draw his attention to the remarks made by hon. Members in this House that the estimate deserves reconsideration in the light of what has been stated here.”

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—“ I wish to point out that there is another work on this list and applying this principle of adding 75 per cent to the rates quoted from this book the estimate amount sanctioned is approximately correct. That item is 52. XXX and 41. Provincial Civil Works. It is only in the case of item 28 there is an enormous increase and I therefore wish to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister to that fact.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ Before the House gives permission to the hon. Member to withdraw his motion, may I say, Sir, that this very item finds place in last year's budget? The figure entered there as the total of the estimate is Rs. 52,300 and the authority sanctioning it is given as a Government Order, dated 24th April 1917. Since April 1917, there have been increases in the cost of labour and building materials. That, I presume, accounts for the fact that the estimate is now entered as Rs. 63,300. But in the absence of the estimate, I am entirely unable to say whether it follows

25th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

the particular type-design referred to by my hon. Friend Mr. Namberumal Chettiar. I do not think we can profitably discuss the details of the case. We must leave that issue to the Minister to settle with the Chief Engineer afterwards if need be."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

*Motion 705.*

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

705. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 20,000 for residence to the Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Western range.*

“Sir, I think a sum of Rs. 56,900 spent on this building should fetch Rs. 5,700 per annum (providing 7 or  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent for the capital cost and  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent for maintenance and repair) or Rs. 500 per mensem approximately. The utmost that we can realize from the occupant is Rs. 200 per mensem and the net monthly loss for the Government is Rs. 300. I wish to know whether a less pretentious building could not be provided and the loss averted.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“Sir, the position is just the same as that which I explained with regard to the earlier resolution. This particular item was entered in last year's budget and was passed by the Council last year. There is now an increase in the total amount owing, I presume, to the increased cost of labour and building materials in the interval. We want a house for the Deputy Inspector-General of Police at Coimbatore. He is at present allowed to live either in Ootacamund or Coonoor, because he cannot find any accommodation whatsoever at Coimbatore. Whether there is a profit or loss to Government, it is certainly incumbent upon Government to house this police officer in Coimbatore. The questions of the cost of building and the amount of rent that we derive from it are matters for my hon. colleague Mr. Patro.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“The hon. the Home Member observed that, because we sanctioned this amount last year, there does not appear to be any reason for changing our view now.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“May I say at once that something like Rs. 20,000 is expected to be spent on this building before the end of this year, if I do not misapprehend the entry made at page 11 of the Public Works Budget estimate. That is the reason why we must go on with the work.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“If we have already wasted some money paying higher rates than were necessary according to the observation made by my hon. Friend Mr. Namberumal Chettiar, I do not see why we should not go into the matter now if the rates already fixed require revision. Even if we had spent a part of the money, much more remains to be spent. I hope the hon. Minister will kindly re-examine the question of reduction.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“I understand that contracts have already been given.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

[25th March 1922]

*Motion 706.*

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—

706. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1.5 lakhs for constructing temporary buildings for the special police force in Malabar by Rs. 1,00,000.*

*Motion 707.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :

707. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,50,000 for constructing police lines for special police, Malabar.*

“Sir, in page 10 of the Public Works Budget Estimate against item No. 42, in the column ‘references and remarks’, nothing is quoted. It appears to me that this probable outlay of Rs. 50,000 is undoubtedly being spent in the course of the year to meet an emergent occasion, that is to locate certain temporary police officers. It appears to me that there is absolutely no reason why for temporary police permanent buildings should be constructed there. It cannot be the object of the Government that special police should be permanently stationed in Malabar for all time to come. It should only be to meet an emergency and if the country settles down to peace and order, I fail to see in the first place why there is any necessity for constructing police lines at a cost of Rs. 2 lakhs. In the second place, the estimate is stated to be Rs. 2 lakhs. It is within square brackets. It means that the estimate is not finally arrived at. It is only an experiment and a surmise and not a definite amount arrived at by careful calculation and scrutiny. It is also stated that Rs. 50,000 will be spent or has been spent already or is being spent. I think, Sir, that seeing that the trouble has already subsided, the sum of Rs. 50,000 already spent will meet the emergency and no further amount need be spent for this purpose. Moreover I think that if we erect large buildings and place the police there, they will always try to justify their existence there by raking up some trouble here or there and they will try to remain there for ever. It is necessary that no room should be given for such temptation at all. If we give them small quarters and try to get them out of Malabar as early as possible then it will lead to the peaceful and harmonious living of the people as before. I therefore submit that this sum of Rs. 1,50,000 can very well be omitted from this year’s budget.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“The line of criticism which the hon. Member pursued leaves me aghast. It is our desire to maintain the peace of Malabar by the location of a special force, over 600 in number, specially armed and specially equipped and they will, I fear, have to be retained in the district not for one year but for many years to come. I cannot imagine that the inhabitants of Malabar would welcome the immediate withdrawal of this force. If they are to continue there for some years, obviously you must provide them with buildings of a semi-permanent nature for their accommodation. It is only buildings of a semi-permanent nature that are contemplated, and they must be put up before the monsoon. That is the reason why detailed estimates were not in existence at the time when the budget was prepared.

25th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

This matter was engaging the very serious attention of the local officers in Malabar and of the Government in the month of February.

4 p.m.

It was abundantly apparent that we must get a real move on with the construction of these buildings. The question of cost per square foot was carefully examined. I believe I am right in saying that the class of buildings contemplated is of a semi-permanent nature—iron roofing and mud floors with walls and ceilings of wood. I am sorry I cannot give any more details: but this I may say that the scheme of construction makes it probable that if these buildings should ultimately not be required—though I do not myself think that that contingency is likely to arise for many years, a considerable proportion of the materials can be sold. I do not think that the House will require any further justification from me of the necessity of the provision of accommodation for the special police who have to be maintained for the public peace in Malabar."

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAH :—“ Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to say in what places it is proposed to construct the buildings ? ”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ I understand the scheme contemplated is six armed camps in different places. I cannot trust my memory to say in exactly what places the buildings are to be constructed. Perintalmanna is one. I will give the hon. Member a list afterwards. The places were very carefully selected in consultation with Mr. Knapp, Mr. Hitchcock, Mr. Ellis and Mr. Evans. I compared the sites proposed with the maps of Ernad and Walluvanad, and satisfied myself that they are suitable places.”

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAH :—“ Sir, the feeling in the district is that these armed camps should continue for a long time to come. The time is not yet in sight when we can with any sense of public safety abolish the special police force. Therefore I shall appeal to the hon. Mover to withdraw the resolution.”

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“ I do not want to press the motion, Sir.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

*Motions 708 and 709.*

The following motions were not made :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

708. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for constructing quarters for armed reserve town police.*

Rai Rahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

709. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 20,000 to extend the office buildings of the Criminal Investigation Department.*

*Motion 710.*

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHEITI :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

710. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for constructing quarters for the armed reserve.*

[Mr. T. Namberumal Chetti] [25th March 1922]

“The sanctioned estimate is Rs. 1,67,000. But no particulars are given as to the number of huts to be built, the number of quarters for sub-inspectors and for inspectors, etc. Such details would help members to ascertain whether the sanctioned amount is or is not according to cost detailed in the book on type designs.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“I cannot say off-hand. I imagine that this item is identical with item 139 in last year's budget estimate where the details given are one sub-inspector, three sergeants, fourteen head constables and one hundred and forty-three constables. But it is just possible that since then there have been some changes in the strength of the reserve and consequently some expansion of accommodation.”

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—“I withdraw the motion, Sir.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

*Motion 711*

The following motion was not made :—

Rao Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

711. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for constructing quarters for the armed reserve.*

*Motion 712.*

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

712. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for the construction of the engineering school buildings at Vizagapatam.*

“My idea in making this motion is to draw attention to the fact that a certain proportion of the students trained in the school will be of no use in the future. I have got sympathy for my own part of the country and for the construction of engineering school buildings for Vizagapatam. But now, on account of the reduction in the temporary engineering establishment a number of temporary subordinates are without work. Besides this we have a number of passed candidates seeking employment without being able to get any. These engineering students cannot get employment anywhere else except in the Government service or in the local fund department. There are now nearly 150 students trained every year in the college at Guindy and in the school at Vizagapatam. For each student an expenditure of Rs. 2,500 is incurred in addition to his own private expenditure. If students are admitted year after year like this, I am sure that the number of students who succeed from the school and college will be far in excess of the demand either by the Government or by the local bodies. The students who pass from these institutions will be of no use for they cannot like medical students set up private practice. These engineering students have no go other than entry into the Government or quasi-Government service. No doubt in Europe there is scope for private enterprise for engineering students, but in India there is no scope for them as the people cannot afford to pay much for the engineer for their buildings. My principal idea in moving this is that I have been repeatedly

25th March 1922]

[Mr. A. Subbarayudu]

telling the Government that irrigation works are being neglected, and that more money should be devoted to improve them. Irrigation works not only remunerate the Government but profit the people also.

“ My another point is I have no objection to school buildings being constructed at Vizagapatam provided you stop similar classes in the Madras College of Engineering. There is no use spending money without any hope of getting an employment for the students, who spend everything they have to find at the end of their course that they have nothing to fall back upon.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ Repeated representations were made to the Government that the Engineering College was not able to afford room for all the applicants. Year after year a large number of applicants were to be refused admission. In fact the number of admissions was only a very small percentage of the applicants admitted. Resolutions were moved urging on the Government the necessity of starting an engineering institution in the north and in the south to afford facilities for all who sought admission. Now my hon. Friend says that because a policy of retrenchment is being pursued in the Public Works Department there is a certain amount of grumbling among those who have been dispensed with. He asks where are we going to find employment for them ? I will ask him what are we going to do with the people who are turned out of the arts colleges, medical colleges year after year ? It is not merely for the purpose of entering Government service that people must seek admission in these colleges. There are various avenues for them. They can take contracts under the Public Works Department and the Local Boards. The old idea that we are only to look up to the Government service after passing out of the colleges must be given up now.

4-15 p.m. We are changing our policy and principle. In the revised Engineering College calendar we have introduced a clause that there should be no guarantee for students passing out of the college. Originally, in order to draw people into the Engineering College, there was a clause that a certain number would be given appointments. We afterwards found that such a large number were seeking admission that it was necessary to restrict the number, and the guaranteed appointments are also to be taken away. Only yesterday I received a letter from one of my friends from Vizianagaram asking that I should afford facilities for him to get admission to his son in the Vizagapatam Engineering College.

“ Again, now, in view of the Telugu University, there will be several colleges started in the area. We must concentrate our energy in a particular place and we must multiply institutions there in order to achieve the Andhra University. Therefore I am sorry this narrow view of the question with regard to the Engineering College will not be the proper thing. I think the hon. Member will view the whole question in the light I have presented and withdraw his motion.”

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—“ The hon. the Minister was pleased to say that these passed candidates might take up works under Government on contract. I am sorry to say that such contractors who have taken work are few and miserable. Generally, the executive officers do not like passed engineers to work under them, because they might find out their mistakes and expose them. People in the Andhra country have said for a long time that they should

[Mr. A. Subbarayudu]

[25th March 1922]

have an Engineering College at Vizagapatam. It was a fact that there was a demand from a number of Arts students. Then there was some hesitation as to whether a college should be opened at Vizagapatam. Subsequently the Government adopted the policy of admitting graduate students from the several districts and from different communities. That time is now gone. The hon. Minister said that he had several letters from his friends asking for facilities for the admission of their sons into the Engineering College. But even now, people ignorant of the present conditions and the difficulty of getting jobs think that every one of them that pass out of the Engineering College could get the job either of a sub-overseer, or a canal supervisor, which is a very remunerative job. We cannot allow them to think that there is still a genuine demand for these people. We know how many overseers and supervisors are hanging on this Secretariat. What is the fate of these people?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Does the hon. Member want his motion to be voted upon ? ”

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—“ I do not want to press the motion if the hon. the Minister assures me that he will give my appeal a favourable consideration.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. F. PATRO :—“ If he wants all these people to be employed under Government I will have to ask my hon. Friend to find sources for employing these people. Already my hon. Friends have strongly advocated retrenchment, and we have retrenched 6 lakhs. If he wants that all the passed people should be employed, he will have to provide the necessary funds for the purpose.”

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—“ I withdraw the motion.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### *Motions 713 and 714.*

The following motions were not made :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

713. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for the new Engineering school buildings, Vizagapatam.*

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—

714. *To omit the allotment of 0·1 lakh for the construction of a combined girls' school and training school for mistresses at Mangalore.*

#### *Motion 715.*

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

715. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for construction of a combined girls' school and training school for mistresses at Mangalore.*

“ Mr. President, the percentage of scholars to the total population in this Presidency is 4·4. The total number of boys and girls that ought to be in schools is 15 per cent of the total population. In the year, 1920-21, the net expenditure on education was 144 lakhs. When all the boys and girls in the

25th March 1922]

[Mr. E. C. M. Mascarenhas]

country go to school, the expenditure will be not less than 500 lakhs. It is evident that this large amount of money cannot be obtained without further taxation.

“Sir, if education is to be extended and at the same time expenditure kept down as low as possible, Government schools should not be unnecessarily increased, but aided schools encouraged.

“The average annual cost of educating each pupil in Government institutions comes to Rs. 54-9-9, whereas the cost to the Government of such a pupil in an aided institute is Rs. 3-15-2 only, or in other words, it is one-fourteenth of the expenditure in the Government institute.

“Sir, now I will speak on the state of affairs in Mangalore. An aided training school for mistresses was started there in 1890 or 32 years ago. It has trained and is training teachers of all communities. Up till now it has admitted 625 girls and turned out 227 secondary mistresses and 316 elementary mistresses or a total of 543 mistresses and these are employed not only in various parts of this Presidency but also in other Presidencies.

“Instead of allowing this aided institute to develop, Government stepped in, in 1912 and opened a training school for mistresses in a rented building, and now it has made a provision of Rs. 10,000 for a combined training school for mistresses and girls' school. The estimate does not seem to have been prepared as the amount is left blank in the budget estimate. If this Government school is for training elementary mistresses in Kanarese only, then there is no objection; but, if on the other hand, it is the intention of the Educational authorities to develop it into a secondary grade English training school, then I am afraid the existing aided school, which is run cheaply, will have to be closed for want of pupils. I therefore request the hon. the Minister for Education to let this House know—

(a) what the combined girls' school and training school for mistresses will cost for the buildings;

(b) whether the accommodation is for an elementary girls' school and training school for elementary mistresses only; and

(c) whether it is the intention of the Educational authorities to develop it into a secondary grade training school for mistresses.

“Sir, I am asking for this information, so that we may sanction only what expenditure is absolutely necessary for a combined elementary Kanarese training school for the needs of the South Kanara district and nothing more, and also to help in keeping down expenditure on the score of economy, as low as possible.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“Sir, as to the necessity for a training school, there is no question, because the girls' school was there for a very long time and it has been very popular. And attached to the girls' school we have had also a training school at which it is intended not only to train elementary grade but also secondary grade teachers in that part of the West Coast. There are also other private schools which have got such a training section attached to them. In that district there are three girls' schools, but this is a very flourishing girls' school where we have got 400 pupils and most of the pupils are Indian Christians. There are a few Hindus and few European girls also. In order to improve the school a training section was attached, and it is located in a rented building. So, in 1920, the

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

[25th March 1922]

Government sanctioned a new site for the school. Already, Rs. 15,645 was spent for the acquisition of the land, and it will all go to waste if we give it up now. The building is an urgent necessity. The school authorities are pressing on the inspectors and the inspectors have reported to Government that accommodation for locating the training institution is urgently necessary and that it would meet a large demand not only in Mangalore but in the neighbouring taluks also. It will spread over the whole district and the whole district will have a training institution in Mangalore."

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—“ I think the opening of this Government school was a mistake. It was not established long ago, but in 1912. I have some figures. From the year 1915–16 to 1919–20, a total of 221 pupils have been trained in it out of which 4 are Anglo-Indians, 190 Indian Christians, 14 Brahmins and 13 non-Brahmins. In the aided schools, 261 have been trained, in the same period, of which 135 are Anglo-Indians, 120 Indian Christians and 6 non-Brahmins, whereas in the other Government institute we had 190 Indian Christians. Government have established the institute practically for training Indian Christians. Pupils of the other communities are very few. In Malabar also, there are training institutes. I think one is known as the Moyan training institute, and at Calicut also there is a training institute. The opening of a school at Mangalore was unnecessary, and I think the Government will do well to limit it to an elementary training school in Kanarese only.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Does the hon. Member wish to press his motion to a division ?”

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—“ I do not wish to press it to a division, if the hon. the Minister for Education gives me an assurance that he will not develop that institution. I believe this provision of Rs. 10,000 is the thin end of the wedge.”

Rao Bahadur A. RAMAYYA PUNJA :—“ I rise to oppose this motion.

There is a strong necessity felt for a Government girls' school  
4-30 p.m. in Mangalore. The Hindu inhabitants of this town urged upon the Government some years ago the necessity for the establishment of a girls' school there, because for want of a school like this, they had to send their girls to Christian institutions. It was on that consideration that this institution was opened by the Government and provided courses therein for training mistresses also. All are agreed at least that female education ought to be promoted, and that can only be done by a number of mistresses trained in Government training schools. Sanction was accorded for the establishment of such a school, and a piece of land was also acquired for this purpose in September 1920 at a cost of Rs. 15,645. The school was located for the time being in a rented building. Now it is found necessary that the Government should have a building of their own. I think it is with that object a sum of Rs. 10,000 is asked for. I do not see what reasonable objection could be made for building the school on the land that has already been acquired at a cost of Rs. 15,000 odd. The objection now raised that there are already girls' schools conducted by Christian agencies is no reason why Government should not continue their existing school. The effect of withholding this amount would be to shut up the institution. I therefore strongly object to this motion.”

25th March 1922]

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—“ The hon. Mover has based his arguments mainly upon the discussion of the relative merits or advantages of aided institutions *versus* Government institutions. I think it is well for the Council to note that so far as possible the Educational Department and the Minister have been advocating a policy of encouraging the establishment of aided institutions. They do not advocate the maintenance of Government educational institutions except as a very last resort. There are many members present in this chamber who have had to press their claims very vehemently and very ardently upon the Government, asking them to assume control over aided institutions. What I have just stated is, however, the general policy of the Government. I should like further to state that about ten years ago, at a conference of Inspectresses, it was decided that training schools for women teachers in several places were necessary, and so far as the West Coast was concerned, Mangalore headed the list. It might be asked why Mangalore headed the list when, as has been pointed out, there is already one training school in existence there. Formerly, there were two training schools there. One has gone. The position is that at the Mission training school English is the main subject and there are not full facilities for instruction in Kanarese. As it is desirable, if we wish to pay due attention to the encouragement of the vernacular languages— ”

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—“ Aided schools also teach Kanarese.”

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—“ English was the main language of instruction, and Kanarese was subsidiary. At that time numerous applications were received from those in the Training School for exemption from the use of the vernacular language in the examination.”

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—“ Applications for exemptions were apparently received from the Anglo-Indians and not from the other sections of people.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Before we proceed further, I wish to point out that we cannot deal with the whole question of Government schools *versus* aided schools on a motion like this. I would appeal to hon. Members that such a large issue could not be profitably discussed on a small motion like this.”

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—“ We shall have numerous exemptions to be granted if we desire to emphasise that instruction should be in vernacular, and we have received several applications for exemption last year. I might now refer to the report of the Director of Public Instruction for last year—I merely refer to the actual number that has been read by the hon. Mover — wherein you find that in aided schools out of the total number of girls undergoing instruction there are more in number of Europeans, Anglo-Indians and Indian Christian girls than there are in Government schools. If you go into the figures with regard to the Government school in Mangalore, there is only a single Anglo-Indian. There is a large number of Indian Christians, but there are also Indians, i.e., Brahmins and non-Brahmins, while in the aided school there is not a single Brahman or non-Brahman. These, Sir, are the facts. When we set up this Government institution it was for the definite and specific purpose of training teachers in Kanarese as their main language, thus paying attention to the vernacular, and now, when

[Mr. R. Littlehailes]

[25th March 1922]

we find it necessary also for giving more facilities for all classes of people to receive the necessary instruction which they do much more readily in a Government institution than in aided institutions we have to provide such a school. I do not labour further the point, but so far as the point whether such an institution is necessary, I may say, as I have already pointed out, there were previously two schools. One was under the old Basel Mission, but that school was closed. Government stepped in and they maintain their own training school. That might be cited as an argument to show that the Government do not want to start an institution as a rival to an existing one, but only to replace the institution which fell out owing to the war and other causes. I want to impress upon the Members of this Council that we have already acquired the land, we have already got some drawings and plans for the building, and under these conditions the building ought to go on."

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—“ We have not been told what is going to be the cost of the building.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Will the hon. Member withdraw the motion ?”

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—“ If the hon. the Minister will assure me that it will be an elementary training school.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ There can be no conditional withdrawal.”

The motion was put to the vote and lost.

*Motions 716 to 718.*

The following motions were not made :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

716. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for construction of a combined girls' school and training school for mistresses.*

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

717. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

718. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club.*

*Motion 719.*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“ Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

719. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club.*

“ I find at page 10 of the Public Works Budget estimate for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club amounting to Rs. 1,63,800. The probable outlay during 1921-22 is shown as Rs. 11,000 and under 'grant for 1922-23 for works in progress' there is a sum of Rs. 75,000 provided. Sir, this work formed the subject of discussion last year, and in the column of amount of estimate there was absolutely nothing given. No estimate had been prepared and no information was given to the House, but a sum of

25th March 1922] [Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiar]

Rs. 32,000 was asked for, and I remember a number of hon. Members including myself had tabled resolutions for the omission thereof. But owing to the fact that there was no time to discuss this matter, there being other more important items, it was not discussed with the result that it was deemed to have been admitted. Now it appears that Rs. 11,000 has been spent in the year, and our sanction is now asked for an estimate of Rs. 1,63,800 whereof Rs. 75,000 can be utilized this year. I object to the grant as a whole, on the ground that in this year of financial stringency such a large sum of money on an item like this should not be spent. There are also more important grounds on which I object to this. The place has got a very bad reputation. It is that it has been the location of a venereal diseases hospital and the biggest drain in Madras runs alongside of it. This is the property which now belongs to Government and which they now want to improve by spending on it the sum of Rs. 1,63,800. This thing came up for discussion in the Finance Committee and more than one member including Sir James Simpson disapproved of spending any money on this property. That is the opinion of the Finance Committee. Moreover, I heard the same objection raised in this Council also: that money to the extent of Rs. 1,63,800 ought not to be spent on this property.

“There is another reason for my objection. This property is not quite close to any of the colleges. No doubt the Christian College is about two furlongs from this as also the Law College. All the students who are not already located in hostels are living in close proximity to their colleges. This is not useful for anything except as a place for going to in the evening. It is not used by the students of colleges situated at a distance, and it is not a proper centre for them to justify the expenditure of a sum of Rs. 1,63,800 of which Rs. 75,000 is allotted for this year. On these grounds I oppose the grant.”

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB:—“Mr. President, I rise to support the motion. When I came before this Council for a Muhammadan high school in Georgetown and a college in Umdah Bagh for Muhammadans the Government opposed it and said that there were no funds. I sympathised with the Government. But the action of the Government in this case shows that they have got plenty of money or they are acting light-heartedly. They had provided funds for certain improvements to the club. Last year it was said if we do not cut down the funds under this head, the Government might come to us next year with a provision for Rs. 1½ lakhs. Year after year they are going on increasing this allotment.

“This place was formerly used not as a lunatic hospital, but one for the treatment of venereal diseases. With these few words, I support the motion.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—“Mr. President, if at all I rise to speak on this motion, it is not merely because I am the member for the 4-45 p.m. University of Madras, but because all educationists believe in the necessity of a students’ club. We hear a great deal said about the need for the development of the character of the students and for seeing that they do not come under undesirable influences. One of the best ways of maintaining their character and of associating them with desirable men and influences is to provide for them a really good centre where the students can foregather. Those who have been educated in the west will bear testimony to the extreme value from the point of view of character of the famous

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

[25th March 1922]

students' societies called University Unions. This property was taken up and the students' club was started in Madras, if I remember aright, in order to counteract some of the undesirable influences which were working on the students of Madras, and I am told that it is doing very good work. I do not consider the students' club to be anything unnecessary or of the nature of a luxury, but I regard it as an integral part of the University organization. If I remember rightly with regard to all the newer universities that have been started or that are now proposed to be started, provision has been made for a students' club for the under-graduates. I am now only pleading for the principle of having a University students' club. I think it would be a very bad thing indeed if that idea was given up. But after I have listened to my hon. Friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar, I am rather doubtful whether the present site is the best possible one. But, however, that is a matter for the people here, the authorities of the University and the officers of the Education Department to consider and decide upon. I should be very sorry if this House should vote this item out on the ground that the University club is a superfluity. Further, I find that already about Rs. 11,000 have been spent, and if we do not go on with the work and complete it, that money would be a waste. So long as the House does not vote it out on the ground that the University students' club is a luxury, I have nothing to say. Only let not an existing club be destroyed till another and a better one has been put up. But I do hope that the students of Madras, thousands of whom do not know how to spend their evenings between 5 and 7, will be provided with a splendid club in which all can foregather, and spend their time in a manner that will be conducive to their moral character."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“Sir, I do not think there would be any question about the need for a University Students' Club in the City of Madras. This was started three years back with the view of bringing together college students living in Georgetown and of providing for them some common ground where they could meet and spend their evenings satisfactorily. In Georgetown, where a large number of college students live, there are a number of eating houses and hotels where students do not get their meals properly and the hotels are run in a very bad style. Therefore, in order to provide facilities for good food and for good social life this club was started. Another reason why this club was started was that the students of the colleges, for instance, the Christian College and the Pachaiyappa's College have got their hostels, but the Law College and the Medical College have no hostels. Therefore that a large number of students from these colleges, the Law College and the Medical College, may have quarters for themselves. Government have provided its own building. The building belongs to the Government and the Government spent Rs. 11,000 in repairing it. The building is in need of a lot of repair urgently, and in order to make it a residential place for students to live in it as a hostel, a gymnasium is attached to it with the requisite apparatus so that the students may go there morning and evening and take part in gymnasium exercise. This is the object of the students' club, and in order to give facilities for a large number of students who cannot get food in eating houses, meals are provided for them and they are charged for it. As I said, in order that it may be a useful social centre, a gymnasium is provided. In this way a large number of students receive relief from this place and it will be a pity if we should have to cut down anything of the grant. There is also a small reading room attached to it,

25th March 1922]

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

and in course of time it may develop into a regular club. In order that the students of the Madras City and of the colleges in its neighbourhood may very well learn the habits of social life and club life from the beginning and to distract them from the various undesirable influences and directions, they are brought together here so that they may meet each other in the mornings and evenings and thus necessarily have a sort of club life and social life gradually. Friendships and unions are formed and the whole atmosphere will be quite wholesome. Though it is a fact that the present locality is not a very healthy one, that it is in Popham's Broadway and that it was originally used for a hospital and that the building requires urgent repair, the principle of having a university club must be granted by every one. Therefore if this building is considered to be not suitable at all and if we can provide funds, we can find another place, and until then we may use this for the university club. If we are able to get two or three lakhs more we can put up another building, but we want this amount budgeted for, in order to carry on the necessary repairs and make necessary adjustments in the present building so that it may be used as a residential club. A building like that for the purpose of a club is absolutely necessary in these days. As I told you, undesirable influences are working in the minds of the students and we must provide a place where people could visit them from time to time and have social intercourse with them, have social parties so as to have a chastening influence on the members of the club. On the whole, I think it is a very desirable thing. Some time back some of us were invited to go to the place and see how it was working. At present it may not be all that is desirable, but in course of time it is capable of improvement. Therefore, I may say that this motion for a wholesale reduction of the grant is not at all desirable at present."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI:—"Sir, I desire to support the motion for the omission of this grant. Mr. Tanikachala Chettiar in his opening remarks said that the first reason for urging this omission was financial stringency. It also struck me, Sir, as essential that in this year of financial stringency no amount should be spent on a luxury so to speak. But the hon. Member Mr. Ramalinga Reddi said that it should not be considered a luxury and that the Rs. 11,000 already spent on it would be a waste. I do not think so. Buildings in Popham's Broadway are fetching nearly five or six times their value about ten or twenty years ago. For instance, I may mention one building lately occupied by Messrs. Fox & Co. The owners were not able to realize more than Rs. 25,000 thirty years ago, but to-day, even if we offer Rs. 2,50,000 the owner would not sell the property. Even if the Government sell their building now, they would get five or six times its original cost, and the Rs. 11,000 spent on it already would not be a waste. As the surroundings are ill suited to the club, it is well the building is sold now, and a new building provided on the Marina."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, after listening to my friend Mr. Ramalinga Reddi and the hon. the Minister I find that Mr. Ramalinga Reddi supported it only as a club for the evening, whereas the idea of the Minister is to convert it into a hostel which was not what Mr. Ramalinga Reddi wanted. As my friend Mr. Namberumal Chettiar pointed out, the building has a value as house property in Popham's Broadway and the value can be realized by sale and the amount of Rs. 11,000 spent on it would not be a waste, and a suitable building can be obtained in any other locality.

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiar] [25th March 1922]

My friend spoke of foregathering of students. It can be done in the foreshore of Madras. That can very well be done in other parts in Madras where there are more beautiful structures and more desirable surroundings where young men can find amusement. I do not think that the surroundings of the present buildings are conducive to health and there is no scope for recreation. On all these grounds, I press this motion to a division."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“Sir, I believe no objection was raised even by the mover of the motion to the establishment or the advantages of a University students' club. His main objection, so far as I have been able to follow him, was that the building was in an inconvenient locality and that the club was not doing very useful work. If that is the ground of objection, I believe the only way in which we ought to proceed is to allot more funds and have a better building in a more suitable locality. That is the direction in which I would request him to consider the desirability of improving the University students' club rather than by cutting down the provision of Rs. 75,000 made in the next year's budget. I also wish to remind this House that we have all along, in dealing with these buildings, shown consideration to works in progress. This question about the students' club came up last year and the provision was allowed to remain. If it was thought that the building was in an objectionable locality and that different steps should be taken, the better course would have been for a specific motion of the description to be brought forward for the consideration of the Government and the necessary alteration would have been made. Having allowed that provision, I would request the mover himself to consider whether it is desirable to vote down the provision without pointing out at the same time a different building which would be useful for the purpose. So long as it is admitted that these buildings have been in existence and have been used for this purpose during the last three years, so long as it is clear to the members of this Council that the students have been using those buildings with profit and with advantage and so long as it is clear to us that we did allow this provision to remain in the budget of last year, I would request the House not to embark on a policy of undoing the work which has been done in the last two years without having a proper substitute for it. I think also that it would be setting up a bad precedent. But when the Government are in a position to allot larger funds for this purpose, and when we can think of changing the building and having another university students' club, then it would be time enough to consider the suggestion of the hon. Mover as to what to do with the property and whether it would fetch good value or not. But till that time arrives and till the Government or the Minister assures us that he is prepared to find funds on a larger scale and provide a new students' club, I would entreat every one in the House not to take away the institution in existence before taking up another building useful for the purpose. For these reasons, I oppose this motion.”

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“Mr. President, I rise to support the motion of

5 p.m. Mr. Tanikachala Chettiar. As pointed out by Mr. Namberumal Chettiar, I do not see why such a large sum as Rs. 75,000 should be spent upon it if the place is going to be sold. If the Council thinks that this is a place not suitable and wishes to have a central place in a better locality, I do not see any use for the Government spending such a large sum. I agree with my friend Mr. Ramalinga Reddi that a

25th March 1922]

[Mr. P. Subbarayan]

university club is a necessity, but what I say is that such a club should be in a suitable locality and not in the place where it is now. So I support the motion to omit the sum altogether."

**Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU** :—“Sir, I oppose this motion. My friend Mr. Subbarayan says that the surroundings are bad enough for students to live in. Students live in narrow streets and unhealthy lanes and under worse conditions. This club that was established in Georgetown is by far better than many of the hostels in Madras. Instead of accommodating themselves in filthy hotels this is surely a much better arrangement for the students and therefore I oppose this motion.”

**Mr. P. SIVA RAO** :—“Sir, it is very unfortunate that the hon. Member has chosen to press this motion. I expected, Sir, that after what fell from Mr. Ramalinga Reddi and after the lucid statement of the Minister for Education the hon. Mover would withdraw this motion. He has not done so. And I must say, Sir, that this University Students’ Club is a splendid institution which is doing wonderfully good work. First of all I may say, it serves the purpose of a hostel for the Medical and Law students. as also for the other students in Madras. There is only one other hostel, the Victoria Hostel, and this University Club is supposed to supplement the little relief that the Victoria Hostel is giving to the numerous students. Secondly, it serves the purpose of a club where the students are weaned away from undesirable influences and have the advantages of some recreations. Now, Sir, the only objection that is raised against the club is, as stated by **Mr. Namberumal Chettiar**, that the club is a luxury. All seem to concede the principle of a club. But that it is not a luxury has been very well explained by Mr. Ramalinga Reddi. It is by itself an integral part of any University system. Another objection is that it is in a bad locality. There was a Lock hospital there originally. But it can be made quite suitable for students and its unhealthiness also could be set right. The club has gone on for nearly three years and there have been no complaints of its insanitary nature and we have nothing to conclude that this is in an unhealthy quarter. However, that question might still be considered by the Minister for Education before he embarks on further expenditure. And then if he thinks that it is not quite suitable he may make up his mind to select another place. Sir, a sum of Rs. 11,000 has already been spent upon it and the building has been voted upon in the last year’s budget and it went unchallenged. For all these reasons, I appeal to the hon. the Mover not to press the motion, especially when he concedes the principle of founding a club like this.”

The motion was then put to the House and lost.

*Motions 720 to 742.*

The following motions were not made :—

**Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI** :—

720. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students’ Club.*

**Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU** :—

721. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students’ Club.*

[25th March 1922

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

722. To omit the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club.

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—

723. To omit the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club.

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—

724. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,00,000 for constructing a new chemistry block for the Presidency College.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

725. To omit the allotment of Rs. 15,000 for the New General Hospital, Cocanada.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

726. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,00,000 for additions to the Agricultural College and Research Institute.

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—

727. To omit the allotment of Rs. 70,000 for constructing buildings for the cattle farm at Chintaladevi.

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—

728. To omit the allotment of Rs. 50,000 for the construction of buildings for the Madras Trades School.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

729. To omit the allotment of Rs. 50,000 for construction of buildings for the Madras Trades School.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—

730. To omit the allotment of Rs. 22,000, for wages of coolies.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

731. To omit the allotment of Rs. 22,000 for wages of coolies.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

732. To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,000 for charges for carting articles.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—

733. To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,000 for charges for carting articles.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

734. To omit the allotment of Rs. 25,000 for improvements to roads at the main gate of the Government House.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

735. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,14,500 for repairs to Civil Works—Civil buildings for west coast by Rs. 100.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

736. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,24,000 for repairs to Civil Works in the Nilgiris by Rs. 100.

25th March 1922]

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

737. To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for one assistant to the consulting architect.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

738. To omit the allotment of Rs. 7,322 for one deputy sanitary engineer.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—

739. To omit the allotment of Rs. 7,322 for one deputy sanitary engineer.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

740. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 14,950 for two assistant sanitary engineers on the specialist scale by Rs. 7,475.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

741. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 14,950 for two assistant sanitary engineers by Rs. 7,475.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—

742. To reduce the allotment for 4 assistant sanitary engineers by the cost of 3.

*Motion 743.*

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

743. To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,846 for one temporary assistant sanitary engineer.

“Sir, I must say that the present establishment of the Sanitary Engineering department consists of one sanitary engineer, two deputy sanitary engineers and four assistant engineers. This question of the establishment necessary for the sanitary engineering department was considered at length by the Finance Committee in consultation with the Chief Engineer and the decision of the Finance Committee was there should be one sanitary engineer, one deputy sanitary engineer and one assistant engineer. It was represented to me afterwards that it was necessary to have one deputy sanitary engineer more to provide one for the North and one for the South. In accepting that arrangement we thought we could allow two deputy sanitary engineers and two assistant sanitary engineers and the rest who are temporary could go. This was what we thought and we have also expressed that. One deputy sanitary engineer and one assistant sanitary engineer are already permanent and the others have been temporarily drafted from the Public Works Department and so there will be no difficulty in asking those not wanted to revert to their permanent places.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“Sir, there is a good deal of justification in asking the temporary men to revert to their former places. I shall be prepared to consider it.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“Sir, as the hon. the Minister has not said that he accepts it, I press the motion.”

The motion was put to the House and carried.

[25th March 1922]

*Motion 744.*

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

744. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,600 for assistant sanitary engineer*

“Sir, this is the second of the appointments mentioned by me in the previous motion and it can go. The other appointment has already been voted against.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“I agree.”

The motion was put and carried.

*Motion 745.*

5-15 p.m. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

745. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,350 for the personal assistant to the sanitary engineer.*

“In fact, as has been already pointed out, there are one chief sanitary engineer, two deputy sanitary engineers and even after the omission of two assistant sanitary engineers, there are still left two assistant sanitary engineers. Their work is very little and I do not think there is need for a personal assistant to the sanitary engineer. In fact the whole allotment for works is only about Rs. 8 lakhs and there is not a pretty large number of works, and at this rate it will take six years more for finishing the works that are already in progress. There are other works that are sanctioned but waiting to be executed, works waiting to be sanctioned and works waiting for the preparation of plans and so on. Practically there is no work for the personal assistant to the sanitary engineer.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“The specialist cadre consists of one sanitary engineer, two deputy sanitary engineers and two assistant sanitary engineers. Now, the sanitary engineer requires a personal assistant, because he has to do a lot of routine work and he has also to attend to the drawings. It may be we have not got much work to do at present, but there are large number of schemes for which plans and estimates have been prepared last year and which have been scrutinized by the chief engineer, and there are also other schemes for which plans and estimates are under preparation. When the sanitary engineer goes on tour, it is necessary that there should be a responsible officer at the headquarters to look after the office. Therefore, as in the case of every other chief officer, the sanitary engineer requires a personal assistant to look after the office work during his absence on tour. Though it may seem that he has no work now, under ordinary circumstances it will be found necessary to have a personal assistant. The personal assistant is not borne on the cadre of specialists. So it is very necessary to retain the personal assistant to the sanitary engineer.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“I am at a loss to understand the arguments of the hon. the Minister. There are four officers in this office besides the sanitary engineer, namely, two deputy sanitary engineers and two assistant sanitary engineers and they are all in one and the same place. At least one of them can be expected to be at the headquarters while the others are away on tour. In fact, I do not see, Sir, any

25th March 1922] | Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

necessity for a personal assistant in an office like this. If the officers are posted in different places, then I can understand the necessity for this post. In the case of the other chief officers, there may be necessity for a personal assistant because there is no other officer capable of doing the work in the absence of the chief officer. But in this particular case, Sir, all these five officers are in the same place and I do not see there is any necessity for a personal assistant at all. The argument of the hon. the Minister does not at all take account of the officers besides the Sanitary Engineer. Now, I am sure, he will find his way to accept the resolution that has been moved."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“ I only wish to emphasise the point that we cannot subscribe to the suggestion of the hon. the Minister for Public Works that every officer should have a personal assistant. I do not think that it is the standpoint from which we must look at this question. We must consider each case on its merits. In this particular case if the sanitary engineer has got sufficient work to require a personal assistant, then it is our duty to sanction it. If, on the other hand, there is not sufficient work, there is no necessity for sanctioning this post. The statement made by the hon. the Minister that this year he has not got sufficient work is itself sufficient to justify the deletion of the appointment. So far as the increase of work in future years is concerned, I think we can deal with such cases as they arise. I think it is our duty now not to vote for this personal assistant. If the work accumulates and if it is found necessary to have this officer, it will be time enough for the hon. the Minister to bring in a motion for renewing the appointment. There is no necessity for continuing the post.”

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—“ I only want to ask for information. I find from the list of officers a large number of Assistant Sanitary Engineers and also an office manager. I want to know whether this personal assistant is a technically qualified officer like the sanitary engineer himself, so that he can render technical aid to the sanitary engineer and look after the technical section of the work also during his absence, or whether he has simply to run the office and get the routine work done, in which case there is the office manager to do such things. I should like to have this information.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ The personal assistant is a technical man and he has been in service for thirty years.”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ Let us see what the work of this whole of the Sanitary Engineer's Department is. They are not an executive staff. Their work consists mainly in drawing up plans and estimates for water-works and drainage schemes, and giving advice to the Government and to the officers of the ordinary Public Works Department.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ I propose to give them also execution work in the case of the schemes prepared by them, and a specialist cadre has been formed to carry on this work.”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ I was speaking of the work that they now do and not of what is proposed to be given to them hereafter. When that measure is adopted the Government can come forward and ask for more establishment. As it is, their work consists in designing certain schemes and in giving advice with reference to water-works and drainage

[Mr M. Krishnan Nayar] [25th March 1922]

schemes. When once these schemes are completed, the actual execution of the work is entrusted to the ordinary officers of the Public Works Department and, as I submitted, there are now one chief sanitary engineer, two deputy sanitary engineers and, even after the omission of two assistant sanitary engineers, two more assistant sanitary engineers, so that there are five officers, and if my information is correct, all these officers are located in the same building and the only other work that they have is to inspect and examine the drainage works and water-works that have already been completed. With reference to this inspection of water-works which are 29 in number, the personal assistant has nothing to do, because he has only got office management. Even if somebody is necessary to look after the work in the office during the absence of the sanitary engineer, there are the other officers like the deputy sanitary engineers and the assistant sanitary engineers, and it is absolutely unnecessary to have the personal assistant also. This resolution is not intended to send away the present personal assistant. When he retires the vacancy need not be filled up. When that contingency arises, there is no need to have this post."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"If this resolution is passed, it will be necessary to pass an order to send him away and he will lose his pay for the month of March."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I do not care for the consequences. I believe, as my hon. Friend has told us that he has already put in thirty years' service, he can very well be sent away."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—"I have given notice of a motion to do away with the whole establishment and I wish to take this opportunity of expressing my views on that matter."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Order, order. I daresay the hon. Member realizes that the present motion is with reference to the appointment of the personal assistant to the sanitary engineer, whether it is necessary to retain the provision for his post or not. We are not at present concerned with the question of the whole establishment."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—"I suppose the qualifications of these officers in the sanitary establishment are the same as those of Public Works department officers and I know that several ordinary Public Works department officers do sanitary work also. I do not see any difference between the qualifications of one set of officers and those of the other set, and therefore there is no necessity at all for an establishment costing Rs. 1.61 lakhs annually, and as we are agreed already that a major portion of this item should be cut down, I think the personal assistant also may be done away with."

"There is one more point. The sanitary engineer also may not be necessary, and his place may very well be taken by one of the deputy sanitary engineers, and if the arrangement for doing away with the sanitary engineer is agreed to, the whole department can be run by the two deputy sanitary engineers and two assistant sanitary engineers, and I hope the hon. the Minister will think of giving effect to this suggestion."

Mr. S. T. SHANMUKHAM PILLAI:—"No case of necessity is made out for a personal assistant in the present case. I take this opportunity of

25th March 1922] [Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai]

saying that as a rule the practice of giving a personal assistant to the head of an office or department must be discouraged as much as possible, unless the Government is prepared to make the head of the office idle or to keep on an incompetent man."

A poll was taken with the following result:—

*Ayes.*

1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi.	25. Mr. P. Siva Rao.
2. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad Bahadur.	26. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimha Charlu.
3. Dr. M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu.	27. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju.
4. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar.	28. Mr. K. V. Ramachari.
5. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu.	29. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
6. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai.	30. Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahassayo.
7. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu.	31. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.
8. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar.	32. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
9. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar.	33. Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
10. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar.	34. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu.
11. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu.	35. Mr. S. Arupadaswami Udaiyan.
12. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi.	36. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai.
13. Mr. P. T. Rajan.	37. Rai Sahib E. C. M. Mascarenhas.
14. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja.	38. The Zamindar of Mandasra.
15. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar.	39. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan.
16. Mr. T. Somasundara Mudaliyar.	40. Mr. A. D. M. Bayotti Sahib.
17. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai.	41. Mr. Ahmad Miyan Sahib Bahadur.
18. Mr. A. Subbarayudu.	42. Mr. Saiyid Muhammad Padsha Sahib Bahadur.
19. Mr. P. Subbarayan.	43. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib Bahadur.
20. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar.	44. Munshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib.
21. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu.	45. Mr. Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razzaq Sahib.
22. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu.	46. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur.
23. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.	
24. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu.	

*Noes.*

1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson.	9. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton.
2. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter.	10. Mr. R. Littlehailes.
3. The hon. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur.	11. Mr. E. Periyanayagam.
4. The hon. Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar.	12. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar.
5. The hon. Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu.	13. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
6. The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro.	14. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu.
7. Mr. T. E. Moir.	15. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai.
8. Mr. F. J. Richards.	16. Mr. S. Muttumanikka Achari.
	17. Mr. A. P. I. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar.

The motion was carried, 46 voting for and 17 against it.

*Motion 746.*

The following motion therefore fell through:—

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—

746. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,356 for the personal assistant to the sanitary engineer.*

*Motion 747.*

5-30 p.m. The following motion was not made:—

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—

747. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,61,575 for sanitary engineering department.*

[25th March 1922]

*Motion 748.*

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

748. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 19,88,613 for establishment by Rs. 2,00,000.*

“ I want to raise a question which I have raised more than once in the Finance Committee that one way in which the extraordinary cost of the establishment could be reduced is by taking away all the intermediate officers between the district officers and those at the headquarters. It was thought so far as the Public Works department was concerned that the question of the abolition of the superintending engineers was a matter which required the scrutiny of the Government. It was said, Sir, that the superintending engineers had a lot of work to do besides ordinary supervision and it was said that in regard to estimates, they had the power of sanction beyond a certain limit and that the work could not be left either to the executive engineer or to the Chief Engineer. Sir, in regard to this matter, by the kindness of the Chief Engineer I was able to get some insight into the working of the office and I found, Sir, that in this department as in others there was much room for decentralization. It was said that a deputy secretary was necessary at the headquarters because the superintending engineers were not scrutinizing some of the estimates sent to the Chief Engineer. It was said that the estimates were sent directly to the headquarters and that they were not scrutinized by the superintending engineer. It was said, Sir, that these estimates were scrutinized by the Chief Engineer's office. In regard to a large number of works the Superintending Engineer gives his sanction at the present moment and unless his work is decentralized in order to give a little more power to the executive engineers, it may not be possible to reduce the number of superintending engineers. It was also said that these superintending engineers were also inspectors of local board works and as such they could not be removed. It seems to me, Sir, if only the principle of decentralization is given effect to and more powers are given to the executive engineers and if the estimates that pass from the superintending engineers are scrutinized by them and not merely sent in a post office like fashion, I think there will be room for taking away the deputy secretary in the office and though it will not be possible to take away all the superintending engineers it seems to me there is room for reducing the number by one or two. These are matters which I should like that the hon. the Minister and the Chief Engineer would consider deeply and if they only accept the principle of decentralization and try to carry it out we can make large savings. It is with the intention of drawing the attention of the hon. the Minister and the Chief Engineer to this aspect of the matter that I make this motion.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ Sir, I may say that the Public Works department has done its best in going into the matter of the whole establishment and cutting it down as far as possible. For some time to come this department will have to work under considerable difficulty and disadvantage. A large number of officers having been dispensed with, we have to reorganize the department, redistribute the work, and re-adjust the jurisdiction. My hon. Friend Mr. A. Subbarayudu has referred to the large number of

25th March 1922]

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

officers that were dispensed with; nevertheless redistribution of the work is a great problem for us. While we have done so much in the office recently, it is rather too much for my friend to press the matter again. In course of time I hope to be able to examine with the assistance of the Chief Engineer how far decentralization could be given effect to and the work could be reduced. Unless the work is reduced at the Chief Engineer's office, it is not possible to dispense with any of the officers now in existence. I have already told the House in my general remarks about the necessity and desirability of retaining the superintending engineers. They fill a place that is absolutely necessary in the scheme of the work of the Public Works department. It is impossible that they could be eliminated in carrying out the works. There are large responsibilities vested in the superintending engineer. While the executive engineers are entirely entrusted with carrying out the execution of works according to plans and estimates, the superintending engineers have to supervise their work and they have got also some original powers. It is not possible for me to assure my friend, but I am quite willing to consider all that he has said and see whether we can work on with the limited establishment we have now."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“As I said, Sir, my intention in bringing this motion was to bring to the notice of the hon. the Minister for his consideration and examination, the question of further retrenchment in the establishment of this department and in view of the remarks of the hon. the Minister, I do not press my motion and beg leave to withdraw it.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### *Motion 749.*

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

749. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 58,36,692 for Civil Works by 5,00,000.*

“Sir, in moving for the reduction, I do not wish to take the House through the various allotments made in the public Works estimates, but I wish the House to consider whether it is not possible for us to put off out of the provision made for the next year a portion of the total allotment made.

“I do not wish to suggest that we should put off works in progress and that we should give up schemes already sanctioned or already in operation. But if we realize that we are required now to vote for large sums of money for civil works, however valuable and necessary the works may be, that we will be called upon to vote large sums of money as per supplemental motions of which notice has been given it will be apparent that a fresh reconsideration of the allotment made is necessary with the object of effecting retrenchment. If I put it at a sum of five lakhs, it is because I felt that if we confine our attention to urgent works and if we put off the completion of works in progress for another year, it will be possible for us to effect a saving in the provision to that extent. No doubt, while we were dealing with various specific motions, objections were raised as to the necessity for particular works. It was pointed out that we must provide for the residence of officers and for new Collector's office at Vellore regarding the policy of which no objection was taken. But in a year when we are required to strain every nerve to

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [25th March 1922]

find additional funds by additional taxation and by other means it must be our duty to effect as much saving as we can. It is a small portion of the amount entered in the budget estimate that I wish to omit. I think the House may adopt the principle which it enunciated in dealing with some of the motions, not all, of making a reduction from the total grant."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“I must say with due deference to my hon. Friend that it is most unfair that such a motion should be tabled in connexion with the Public Works Department. Having reduced six lakhs of rupees, having cut down 18 per cent of the establishment as it was originally proposed, the unfortunate rule that the House applied to the case of reduction of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  or 2 per cent should be applied to this case also seems to me doing great injustice to the department which has conscientiously and dutifully carried out the instructions of this House and of His Excellency. I am surprised that my hon. Friend should have pressed this motion at all and made a speech on it. If he had not known the fact that the only department that has done its best and loyally carried out the wishes of this House and of His Excellency, he would not press the motion. But having known that, that he should propose this motion seems to me unfair and ungenerous. Moreover, the allotment consists of voted and non-voted items and motions have been tabled asking for curtailment in various directions. Hon. Members have, either out of consideration for the subject, or for the reason that they were not able to support the motions, withdrawn them or abandoned them. In spite of it, that my hon. friend from Nellore should have tabled a motion for a reduction of five lakhs of rupees in a department which has already retrenched six lakhs of rupees seems to be doing the greatest injustice to the department and I am sure the House will not agree with him.”

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“Sir, my hon. Friend opposite has made an appeal to this House not to accept this motion on the ground that the department has already effected retrenchment in various directions and that we should not go further. I wish to draw a distinction between retrenchment effected in the case of reduction of establishments and that effected in the case of the allotment under works. I have not in my opening remarks made any reference to the reduction under establishment.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“My hon. Friend has not tabled any motion with reference to any particular work to be carried out to be eliminated.”

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“I think my hon. Friend should have been patient to have understood my main point. As I stated in the beginning, I think that in matters of this description where one department or another has tried to include in the budget various works, if the House considers that it is necessary to effect a retrenchment under this head, I thought, Sir, and I even now think that it is more desirable to effect a reduction in the general allotment leaving the various departmental officers to put their heads together and see what works are urgent and what not. In that manner retrenchment can be effected; and it is for that reason and it is after due consideration that I proposed not to affect this particular item or that regarding which the head of departments had placed a provision in the budget, but to put it before the House whether, taking a proper view of the situation, we cannot reduce the total allotment by a specific sum. I believe

25th March 1922] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

in the correctness of the course pursued by me. Now, Sir, regarding the suggestion made that in the case of a department that has already applied the pruning knife to a considerable extent we should be fair in pressing further, I quite accept the position that there has been substantial retrenchment effected in the department. I quite realize in the case of the establishment there has been a reduction to an extent to which I myself was not prepared to go. I am of opinion that with the limited establishment it may not be possible to spend this year any large amount. What I want to maintain and the House to consider is this: whether the House is entitled to vote for such a large sum and whether we cannot go further and reduce the allotment. I cannot at all understand the surprise of my hon. Friend regarding the position taken up by me when the allotment proposed to be affected is that on works. And then, my hon. Friend said that no specific item was mentioned. It was so because I wanted to give a wide latitude, an absolute discretion in the matter of selecting works to the officers concerned."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"The list of works rests with the departments concerned and the Public Works department are merely agencies for carrying out the works demanded by the other departments of Government."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"That is the very reason why I stated already that the departmental officers ought to put their heads together and see what buildings can be put off. If I now referred to my hon. Friend opposite, it is not because I ignored that fact but because I wanted my hon. Friend who has no doubt been very earnest in retrenching to see whether some more money cannot be saved in this particular direction. I do not want to tie his hands or fetter his discretion or embarrass his position, but I only appeal to him to sit down quietly after this session has passed and to see whether some of the works proposed could not be put off for some time to come and whether expenditure on some buildings cannot be cut off so that we may save some more money in the year to come. I do not want to embarrass the position of my hon. Friend by pressing the motion to a division. With these remarks, I beg leave to withdraw it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

*Motions 750 and 751.*

The following motions were not made:—

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—

750. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 58,36,692 for civil works by 100.*

Mr. N. A. V. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI:—

751. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 78·11 lakhs for Demand under Civil Works—Public Works officers by 10 lakhs.*

Demand XXVIII—Civil Works for a grant of 78·11 lakhs minus Rs. 12,796 was then put and granted *nem. con.*

The House then adjourned at 5-45 p.m. to meet at 11 a.m. on Monday the 27th March 1922.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,  
*Secretary to the Legislative Council.*